## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. **Rejection of claims 1-3, 5-6, 9 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by over Satoh et al. (US 6,523,966) in view of Kitazawa al. (US 5,070,431):**

Claim 1 includes the limitation "a scattering pattern is disposed over the inner wall of at least one scattering aperture" that is distinct from the cited prior art. In addition, claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Specifically, the limitation "the diffusing plate further comprising a plurality of **scattering particles formed inside the diffusing plate to uniform the light generated by the point light source generators**" has been added to claim 1. This limitation finds support in original claim 3 for instance, and no new matter is entered.

With regard to US 6,523,966, Satoh discloses a backlight module including:

a plurality of luminous elements 23;

a light conductor 20; and

a plurality of light diffusing means 55 formed in the light conductor 20.

Satoh does not teach using diffusing particles to uniform light generated by the luminous elements. In addition, Satoh fails to disclose use of scattering patterns formed over the inner wall of at least one scattering aperture.

With regard to US 5,070,431, Kitazawa teaches using a rough surface 13a formed in a diffusing plate 13. However, the rough surface 13a does not face the light emitting elements 15 and correspond to the light emitting elements 15. Since the position of the rough surface 13a does not correspond to the light emitting elements 15, the rough surface 13a cannot be interpreted as the scattering pattern of the present

application. Furthermore, the Examiner asserts that Kitazawa has disclosed using the scattering particles. Nevertheless, applicants cannot find any teachings about use of scattering particles or like means in Kitazawa's teaching.

In conclusion, neither Satoh nor Kitazawa fail to teach use of scattering particles to uniform light. In addition, Kitazawa's rough surface 13a is not disposed corresponding to the point light source generators, and therefore the light scattering mechanism of the present invention in which the scattering patterns is disposed in the inner wall of the scattering apertures is patentably distinct from Kitazawa's rough surface. Thus, the back light module of claim 1 is non-obvious to Satoh's teaching and Kitazawa's teaching. Reconsideration of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 further teaches that the scattering aperture is circular, rectangular, or trapezoidal in shape. On the other hand, Neither Satoh nor Kitazawa fails to teach any modifications of the light diffusing means. In addition, claim 6 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable. Therefore, claim 6 should be patentable, and reconsideration of claim 6 is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 teaches the scattering patterns of the present application further comprising a plurality of V-trenches or a plurality of arc trenches. Satoh fails to teach the scattering patterns, not to mention the shape of the scattering pattern. Kitazawa simply teaches using a rough surface of a diffusing plate without suggesting any further modifications of the rough surface. In addition, claim 9 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable. Thus, claim 9 should be patentable, and reconsideration of claim 9 is respectfully requested.

Claim 14 teaches each of the inner walls of the scattering apertures

having the scattering pattern. Satoh and Kitazawa fail to teach this limitation. In addition, claim 14 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable. Thus, claim 14 should be patentable, and reconsideration of claim 14 is respectfully requested..

2. **Rejection of claims 11-12 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Satoh et al. (US 6,523,966) in view of Kitazawa et al. (US 5,070,431), and further in view of Pelka et al. (US 6,134,092):**

Claims 11-12 and 15-16 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claims 11-12 and 15-16 is therefore respectfully requested.

3. **Rejection of claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitazawa et al. (US 5,070,431) in view of Baron (US 4,843,381):**

Claim 1 includes the limitation "a scattering pattern is disposed over the inner wall of at least one scattering aperture" that is distinct from the cited prior art. Besides, claim 1 has been amended to add the limitation "the diffusing plate further comprising a plurality of **scattering particles formed inside the diffusing plate to uniform the light generated by the point light source generators**" to overcome this rejection. This limitation finds support in original claim 3 for instance, and no new matter is entered.

With regard to US 5,070,431, Kitazawa discloses recesses 12a and 12b corresponding to the light emitting elements 15 and 16. However, Kitazawa fails to teach that the recesses 12a and 12b have scattering patterns disposed in the inner wall. Instead. Kitazawa teaches forming the rough surface 13a on the surface of the diffusing plate 13 facing the LCD 11. In addition, Kitazawa also fails to teach use of scattering

particles. Therefore, even though Baron teaches a first light diffuser and a second light diffuser installed above the diffusing plate, it would not have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the backlight module of Kitazawa to incorporate the second light diffuser of Baron. Thus, claim 1 should be allowed, and reconsideration of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 13 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claim 13 is therefore respectfully requested.

4. **Cancellation of claims:**

Claims 2-5, 7-8 and 10 have been cancelled.

5. **New claim 17:**

Claim 17 claims a **direct type** backlight module in which the point light source generator are directly disposed under the diffusing plate. This direct type backlight module finds supports in Fig.2, for instance, in which the point light source generators are disposed under the light diffusing plate. The cited arts including Satoh's teaching and Kitazawa's teaching disclose edge type backlight modules in which the light sources are disposed alongside the light guide plate. In addition, claim 17 also includes the limitations "a scattering pattern is disposed over the inner wall of at least one scattering aperture" and "the diffusing plate further comprising a plurality of scattering particles formed inside the diffusing plate to uniform the light generated by the point light source generators". Thus, claim 17 is patentably distinct from the cited arts, and should be allowed. Consideration of claim 17 is therefore requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,

Winston Hsu Date: September 7, 2005

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562
Facsimile: 806-498-6673
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)